DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 996 IR 008 328

AUTHOR Allardyce, A.; Vickers, S. C. J.
TITLE The International Exchange of Publications and International Lending--Is There a Useful Relationship?
PUB DATE Aug 79
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Conference of the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (45th, Copenhagen, Denmark, August 27-September 1, 1979). For related document, see IR 008 320.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Exchange Programs; Information Centers; *Interlibrary Loans; *International Educational Exchange; Library Acquisition; Library Cooperation; *Publications; Technology

ABSTRACT

The exchange of publications and international lending are both international interlibrary activities for bringing to a library works which are not owned by that library or which are owned in insufficient quantity to meet demand. This paper examines the relationships between the two to determine which would in practice be of assistance to the reader. Only in countries where every resource must be employed to save currency in the acquisition of foreign material or where the development of a strong international exchange program is given priority would coordination seem beneficial, and this might be at a sacrifice of the real need of the foreign lender or borrower, unless the alternative is offered without extra delay or cost in the first instance. The exception might be where the resources of a duplicate exchange center may match interlending demand among countries of common culture, and that seems likely to be less useful than well organized international loan arrangements. Some current blanket exchanges of periodicals or dissertations might be unnecessary if interlending could be improved or selective on-demand exchanges developed. The usefulness of duplicate exchange to help build up dedicated loan collections is beyond question; and the extent to which it will mitigate the need for borrowing depends on coincidence of the supply and the loan demand, although long term trends may smooth out disparities. (Author/CMV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED185996

IFLA Council 1979
Division: Collections and Services
Section:

25/COLL/IE

Fr. Gr. I.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The International Exchange of Publications and International Lending - Is There a Useful Relationship?

by

A. ALLARDYCE
British Library Lending Division
Boston Spa, UK

and

S.C.J. VICKERS
IFLA UAP Office
Boston Spa, UK

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol Kucen Henry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR008328

THE INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF PUBLICATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL LENDING - IS THERE A USEFUL RELATIONSHIP?

A ALLARDYCE AND S C J VICKERS

A draft of this paper* was given last year at Strbske Pleso to a closed joint meeting of the IFLA Standing Committees of the Sections on Exchange and Interlending. Comments were invited both at the meeting and by letter to members of both Committees. As a result of substantial support some conclusions have now been emphasised and new comments have also been included and considered. The authors gratefully acknowledge this help.

Interlending and the exchange of publications are separate elements of UAP. There is no question but that both have their part to play. Unless material is acquired (whether by exchange or gift or purchase) it cannot be made available; without efficient interlending availability will be restricted to local access. Following an initiative taken by Unesco(1), IFLA has concerned itself for some time with possible relationships between exchange and interlending because no practicable help to reader satisfaction should be neglected. This paper will try to clarify which of these relationships would in practice be of assistance to the reader.

Objectives and Functions

The exchange of publications and international lending are both international interlibrary activities for bringing to a library works which are not owned by that library or which are owned in insufficient quantity to meet demand. There the resemblance ceases. Exchange may be used to obtain material whether specifically requested by a reader or not; interlending deals only with the specific requests of readers (save for the special purposes of photocopying or reprinting within the limits of copyright legislation). Exchange generally has a long-term function; interlending inevitably has a short-term goal. International exchange is part of the acquisitions process to be used (1) where a permanent need is identified and the cost of retention justified (2) in preference to purchase by reason

---

* S C J VICKERS AND A ALLARDYCE. The interrelationship between the international exchange of publications and international lending.

either of the would-be acquirer's situation (eg lack of foreign currency) or of the circumstances of publication (eg non-commercial or from a country where bibliographical control is poor or the book-trade is not equipped to meet domestic and foreign demand). International lending has as its aim: "The supply /on loan/ by one country to another, in the surest and fastest way, of documents that are not available in the country where they are needed. Lending is held to include the provision of photocopies and microforms."(2)

In the study of possible relationships, the initial decision by the requesting library to acquire or to borrow is taken to be significant, not the eventual unforeseeable outcome of the transaction. There seems little point in the context of this paper in trying to systematise the circumstances in which for local reasons a request to borrow is met by gift, exchange or sale, or a proposal for exchange is met by a loan. Such details are of interest to the library historian but are relevant to international library planning only if information to guide the initial decision can be provided by directories or if they form a pattern which may become a model or the basis of a system. This aspect is further discussed under (1) below.

Aspects to be studied include:

1) whether one activity may theoretically be substituted for the other
2) substitution in current practice, in outline
3) a closer look at substitution possibilities
4) whether one activity may effectively be used to supplement the other
5) whether new technologies are likely to promote or hinder relationships between the two activities.

The discussion below is numbered 1-5 accordingly.

(1) The substitution of one activity for the other - the theory

The results of the two activities coincide when material is received to satisfy the specific requests of readers. Are there circumstances in which these results can be reached effectively by either process?

Where interlending cannot be relied on.

At the outset it should be said that even where borrowing is indicated as the "surest and fastest way", it is not at present possible to borrow from some countries various categories of material eg dissertations, official publications, in-print books. What is to be done in these cases? Interlending is simpler and quicker, and usually cheaper, than purchase or exchange since it does not involve the borrower further than in refund of costs, and the chance of success is higher. Exchange does not necessarily offer a range of publications matching interlending demand for all subjects and periods, and to document the possibilities or gaps for intending borrowers would be an impossible task. Permanent improvement in such areas is therefore a matter for IFLA's programme of Universal Availability of Publications(3). "One particular principle of UAP is that every country should make its national imprints - documents published in the country - available by loan or photocopy both to its own citizens and to other countries".

Anything short of this is merely expedient, but where expedience is inevitable it is better systematised. One way of systematising such gaps in loan availability might be to identify them at the national level in the Brief Guide to Centres of International Lending and Photocopying(4), together with an indication of whether purchase or exchange is possible, so that would-be borrowers would know what to expect. How effective this would be is problematic.

There have been suggestions that where international lending centres and international exchange centres exist together they should coordinate their knowledge of cases in which alternative methods of supply are available. One would hesitate to propose this except on an institutional basis. If interlending is not highly organised nationally, to complicate it might hinder rather than help development, and if it is organised then the use of exchange stocks could only represent failures in the lending system.

The normal case.

This said, the main lines of argument seem to be as follows:

In general, from the viewpoint of the requesting library borrowing is indicated where speed or cheapness or both are important and also where the item clearly falls outside acquisition policy. In these cases exchange would involve the cost (usually far exceeding the cost of an interlibrary loan), of adding to stock an item unwanted for retention, the complication of already complicated inter-loan procedures, and even more the incurring of a quid pro quo obligation, which might be unwelcome. The supplying library may of course have an interest in exchange rather than loan - it may be attached to the publishing institution, or it may have offprints or stocks of the item for exchange which it may wish to use to simplify the transaction, and/or to promote either the institution's prestige or its own acquisition potential. (Incidentally the supply of offprints is usually the authors' privilege and a healthy ad hoc means of direct scholarly communication which they would probably be unwilling to see formalised through an institution). If gift rather than exchange is intended, such generosity will be welcomed by the applying library and would (if not added to stock but used to satisfy the loan) be neither dearer nor slower than lending.

But if the intention is to initiate or enlarge exchange, the transaction would have to be regarded as more properly negotiable under an exchange agreement rather than as a one-off exchange, to which the objection has been given above. In a library not geared to prefer exchange to purchase this usually takes time, involves other departments and frustrates the requirements of speed and cheapness. It seems therefore that the decision whether to borrow or acquire by exchange must rest with the requesting library, and that any substitution should not be unilaterally attempted by the supplying library, but should be arranged in advance by mutual bargain and perhaps within a known range of material - eg in a special subject field. In these circumstances such arrangements are made quite naturally and do not require or benefit by international investigation, although they might be of interest to a special library association.

If the requesting library's primary consideration is acquisition, borrowing in lieu of exchange would be useful only where the copyright law of the country of publication permitted copying, where permission had been obtained or where there was no copyright obligation; but it is doubtful whether

national institutions would, to say the least, risk the antagonism of domestic publishers by lending their works for the purpose of copying without permission, even if it were legal in the recipient's country.

(2) Substitution in practice

Since requests to borrow or exchange are at present usually treated either as one or the other, we know nothing about the extent to which the applying libraries specify both alternatives simultaneously or the extent to which a second alternative is tried and succeeds. There is no reason why a requesting library, having tried one and failed, should not try the other, if time permits. It is combining the two at the first approach which is now being discussed. Mrs Sterescu's paper (5) gives an indication of the extent to which supplying centres and libraries are willing to satisfy requests by exchange instead of the requested loan, although the proportion so satisfied is not indicated, nor always the precise role of the centre or library, nor whether it is an actual practice or merely thought to be feasible. Of 25 exchange centres and 175 institutions that replied to her questionnaire, four national centres stated that they considered it opportune to satisfy certain loan requests by exchange or gift, notably requests for articles (of which reproductions are made), for small cheap items and for their own publications. Ninety seven libraries and institutions considered it opportune to satisfy loan requests for official publications, theses and the publications of their parent institutions by gift and exchange.

Five national exchange centres pass unsatisfied exchange requests on to an interlending centre and four exchange centres receive requests passed on from the interlending centre. In addition 70 institutions stated that exchange and interlending activity are co-ordinated. This co-ordination includes the mutual transmission of requests and the sending on an exchange basis of items requested on loan. The exchange centres in Bulgaria, Iraq, Israel and Romania also act as interlending centres. More detailed information has been supplied from Romania, though even here we do not know the extent to which loan requests received are satisfied by the offer of material on exchange and vice versa. Further, it would seem that while the two activities are co-ordinated, requests sent to other countries from Romania usually specify a preferred method of supply, loan or exchange, and only

in certain unspecified circumstances is the method left to the discretion of the supplying agency. We also know that the Universal Serials and Book Exchange (USBE) has a single issue acquisitions service which is used as a substitute for inter-library loan by many libraries (6).

Loan requests are increasingly being satisfied by the provision of photocopies and microforms. Charges are usually made to cover publication and postage costs, and the material is usually supplied for retention. It is suggested that, while commonly regarded as loan transactions, these reproductions might be made available on the basis of exchange in order to obtain reproductions or original material as a couterpart. One hundred and twenty eight institutions in Mrs Sterescu's survey replied that they could provide reproductions on exchange.

This is really the proposition discussed in (1) above, paragraph 7, which suggests bilateral advance arrangements for a limited range of materials rather than an international system.

Without further knowledge one would guess that the minor publications are presented to save the cost of accounting and because the gift is not a burden on the donor. This is a common practice but can hardly be relied on by borrowing libraries or incorporated into a directory as information for their guidance. In the cases where exchange and lending are handled by the same departments and where the wanted item is not for sale, is available on exchange and is of too great value to be presented, it might be judicious to make a copy available on a loan or exchange basis in the first instance, leaving the exact nature of the transaction to be determined by the recipient, in order to save time and embarrassment. If by analogy the supplying library prefers exchange to re-payment of interlending costs in order to gain an exchange footing, this again, while presenting a perfectly legitimate opportunity for waiving the payment/sending an invoice, with a suggestion of exchange, can hardly be made into a system which would warn the borrower that exchange is expected.

In the circumstances discussed above present practice as reported does not therefore give <u>prima facie</u> support to the theory of substituting interlending for exchange (or vice versa) on a formalised international basis. Section (3) looks at specific possibilities more closely.

(3) Substitution - a closer look

Specific possibilities of substitution not discussed in detail above are now looked at more closely.

(a) A library benefiting from the receipt of multiple copies may supply these copies on an exchange basis in response to loan requests,

(b) Microforms of works held in a loan collection might be prepared and supplied on an exchange basis,

(c) A request for a loan might be transferred to an exchange centre and vice versa,

(d) Some exchange could be replaced by "on demand" exchanges or by interlending,

(e) An exchange centre might make material available on a borrow-or-keep basis.

Category (a) can be only a random practice in libraries which do not receive on deposit or acquire multiple copies of particular works and cannot therefore raise confident expectation in the borrower. Conversely it will be a possibility for recent publications in some of those countries in which the major libraries systematically benefit from the deposit of multiple copies of national imprints, in order to subsidise the acquisition of foreign imprints by exchange as a principal means and in order to compensate for shortages in the book trade caused by limited print runs. It will hardly be common in countries with enough foreign currency or a flourishing book export trade, and libraries in those countries may be unable or unwilling to convert loan to exchange despite the facilities offered.

Some of the limitations relevant to the exchange of microforms (category b) have already been noted, although they may not apply to pairs of countries where there are similar relaxed copyright laws. Microfilming is advocated by Popov (7) as a means of alleviating the shortage of foreign currency, but it is exactly where it would be useful for this purpose that it is prohibited - eg in respect of whole works in the United Kingdom and many other hard currency countries where the sense of authors' rights is highly developed. In any case

it is expensive. In some cases commercial publishers object to their microfilms even being lent abroad in case they are copied (eg American doctoral dissertations). The value of such provision for collection development is therefore very limited.

We have already noted that a certain amount of activity is already taking place within category (c), largely on the initiative of the potential supplying agencies; but as argued above the requesting library must be the best judge of the urgency of a reader's need and of whether it wishes to incur a debt in staff time or money or both. In considering a systematic relationship it is recognised that the requesting library may not know a priori whether an item may be acquired or not, nor whether it is available for loan. However, short of enquiring of potential holding libraries before application is made, which is unrealistic in terms of speed and cost, the decision has to be guided by immediate requirements. The requesting library alone can be the best judge of such requirements. If the inevitable delay caused by rerouting requests is to be compensated by a high probability of success at the second stage there will be considerable problems, either of storage cost of multiple copies or of entering and releasing an alien transaction in a specialised system as well as giving it perhaps unaccustomed priority. The problems are even more complicated than in a pure lending situation where also a choice may need to be made, of keeping a request on a waiting list of other borrowers, or circulating it to other libraries with known locations.

Many countries do not have centres to handle either international exchange or loan requests. In these cases, unless there are clear-cut ad hoc arrangements, it seems that existing interlending delays caused by passing forms from library to library could be compounded by adding exchange stocks as another checking stage. This would also increase costs. The only alternative would be to risk duplicate supply by sending requests simultaneously to both agencies. This would risk confusion too.

Whatever the theoretical undesirability or desirability of such practices, it is essential that where they do happen the actual method of supply is clearly stated by the supplying agency. At present it would seem that material supplied as a gift or an exchange in response to a loan request is often sent

to the exchange department of the requesting library without clarification. The interlending department, unaware of its arrival, may well continue to try to obtain the work on loan while the exchange department, unaware of the reason for its receipt, may either decide that the material is not wanted for stock and that an exchange agreement is not desirable, or add it to stock without satisfying the loan which was the raison d'etre.

It has been suggested that in some instances the current exchange of serial publications results in libraries acquiring a certain amount of unwanted material. At the same time it is difficult to borrow parts when they are required. Some special libraries have expressed a desire to receive individual issues of periodicals on exchange only on request. Thus category (d) would effectively replace interlibrary loans for fringe periodicals containing occasional issues of relevance to the requesting library. While this could prove useful in the light of the unwillingness of many libraries to lend periodicals they have for exchange it should be added that more requests concerning serial publications fall on individual articles rather than whole issues and these needs can be adequately met by the supply on interlibrary loan of photocopies for retention. This might be a great deal easier than storing excess copies of unpopular numbers or reprinting popular ones. It has similarly been suggested that present non-selective arrangements for bulk exchanges of monographic series or theses also result in libraries acquiring a substantial amount of material that they do not need. Many institutions at present restrict the availability on loan of theses or monographic series available on exchange. Important dissertations and monographs are often published in commercial series. The supply of the remaining items by exchange on demand or by interlibrary loan could meet the limited demand for these.

In given circumstances category (e) presents many attractions, but only at the national level. The low unit cost of a duplicate exchange centre with a bulk turnover might make borrow-or-keep transactions, at least for periodicals if priced at the average unit cost, cheaper than the interlending fees now being charged (at least in the US and Canada) by cost-conscious libraries whose primary role is not interlending. In any case, since stock does not have to be re-shelved individually nor return postage incurred,

there is bound to be some saving, although in the majority of cases the true comparison would be with the cost of non-returnable photocopies.

It appears that a phenomenon of interlibrary lending is that most demand is for commonly held periodicals. The British Library Lending Division in a survey carried out for the Swedish Council for Scientific Information and Documentation[8] showed that only 5,500 titles satisfied 80% and 9,000 titles 90% of the demand for periodicals during the survey.

Given three conditions, therefore, such a centre could be successful as a combined lending and duplicate exchange centre:

a) if unit cost is kept lower than interlibrary lending or photocopy costs,

b) if libraries either accept a lower probability of success than with a dedicated loan centre, or the exchange centre can identify, and acquaint its users with, a list of commonly used periodicals it can rely on having currently in stock,

c) if the centre can draw on a rich array of contributing libraries with space problems and active retirement and stock-thinning policies, which are discarding the titles in common loan demand.

Such a centre might play a useful part in the context of restrictive photocopying legislation or the imposition of heavy charges. It should be relatively easy for any country to judge its own possibilities in this direction, but until further studies show that there is a common international core t international loan demand, the international relevance of such an institution is bound to be limited to areas of common culture.

(4) Activity of a supplementing nature

The above points concern the substitution of one activity for the other, in which an exchange partner is treated as an alternative source of supply for interlibrary loans. The following discusses the use of one activity to supplement the other.

Dr Urquhart has outlined a proposal[9] that an exchange balance might be adjusted to cover loan services, including the provision of photocopies and

microforms in response to specific requests from readers. The extent to which such a service would prove useful or may currently be in use is unknown, but it would be particularly beneficial for a country in which currency regulations inhibit not only the purchase of foreign material but also the purchase of photocopies and microforms supplied in response to loan requests. Libraries in poorer countries that have limited stocks may of course still prefer always to acquire material rather than borrow it. The danger here is that materials normally available on exchange, which libraries may be tempted to accept for the sake of enlarging their stock, may be irrelevant to current needs. It might be better for such countries to negotiate foreign interlending facilities in exchange for national imprints. The British Library Lending Division acquires commercially available publications from some foreign libraries in exchange for an equivalent value of British Library Lending Division International Coupons, which can be used for its photocopy service.

Another supplementary relationship concerns postage and transport costs. In exchange these are often balanced and do not come into question. If not, and this is frequently so in interlending transactions, it is suggested that postages due from either type of transaction should be added to the exchange balance, to be met by the supply of literature. While perfectly feasible if accounting is simple and cheap, this suggestion lends itself only to bilateral negotiation and not to international formalisation.

Such relationships will be most satisfactory if the institution responsible for exchange transactions is closely linked to, or even part of, the international lending centre, as coordination is needed to ensure that the exchange remains in balance.

There are two further areas where exchange can support lending. Firstly it has been suggested that retrospective stock building on the basis of exchange will help limit the volume of interlending. It might be thought that the larger the stock of a library the less will it need to obtain on loan from elsewhere. Experience suggests however that a large and increasing stock will cause the expectations of users to rise and so the margin between need and provision will not necessarily decrease. It must be remembered also that the majority of interlending demand falls upon recent publications. Retrospective

collection building will therefore not result in a substantial drop in interlending demand except perhaps in the case of developing countries which need access to information on intermediate technology found in somewhat older publications. Further, a substantial reduction in international lending can only result if the languages most borrowed are those also available on exchange.

There can be no question of the usefulness of exchange in starting and augmenting a dedicated loan collection. That much loan demand falls on relatively few common periodicals, which are readily available through duplicate exchange arrangements, is a significant coincidence. Later efforts to build up stock, while enabling a larger number of requests to be satisfied, are likely to be proportionately less rewarding. Nevertheless it is interesting that with a book stock of 2,100,000 volumes and a periodical stock of 140,000 titles, the British Library Lending Division still adds to stock over 50% of the monographs and up to 10% of the periodicals sent by other libraries to the Gift and Exchange Section. Increasing use is made of the materials acquired in this way - materials that might otherwise be lost to the country if there were no other repository to which libraries could send them, or that might be much less readily available if the repository were not so intimately connected with the national lending service.

A second area of such supplementary activity concerns the use of lists of interlending partners to extend lists of exchange partners. The value and extent of such action may be limited by IFLA's recommendation(2) that international loan requests should be directed via the national centre of the requesting country to the national centre of the supplying country. Nevertheless it is also recognised that not all countries have such centres, and that even when they do some loan requests are directed to individual libraries. It is also recognised that requests for photocopies and microforms need not pass through a national centre. As mentioned earlier, in these circumstances exchange proposals are often made to interlending borrowers, and if they are libraries already used to foreign contact the proposals might be welcome and fruitful, otherwise not.

(5) The impact of technology

Where we know so little about present realities in the relationship we are studying, it would seem futile to try to predict a future affected by developing technologies. Library science fiction might predict that with the central electronic memory accessed from local visual display and printout terminals the need for local collections of actual books and periodicals - and consequently the need for interlibrary lending and exchange - will disappear. Librarians who do not like the prospect may take comfort from the indications that if ever it comes to pass this brave new world may cost so much and be so hostile to human limitations that in this sense most countries will remain undeveloped.

What we must look at is the impact of the technology that can now create national bibliographical data banks, which with decreasing cost of communication and of ever more efficient and capacious minicomputers make rapid scanning from local installations a definite early prospect. Inter-library lending by such means is already with us. It is possible at a remote terminal to identify a wanted reference in BLAISE (The British Library Automated Information Service - an on-line information system which gives access to machine-readable data bases), and at the same time to order a loan or a photocopy of it from the BL's Lending Division. The questions here are whether national input will ever be cheap enough to justify incorporating exchange stocks, which by their nature are ephemeral and probably need to be kept on a separate file, and the cost of repeated access sufficiently low to encourage use of this special file. Since we are discussing international relations, the scope for the use of exchange stocks here internationally would obviously depend on concurrent developments in pairing countries; exchange stocks would probably be at the bottom of the list of priorities. It is far more likely that the only useful relationship is the supportive one, where exchange centres could match duplicates on line with stock records of dedicated lending centres, and fill gaps.

Conclusion

While trying to assess the viability of relationships we must bear in mind the existing pattern and extent of library provision within countries and

ask ourselves whether practical mechanisms for facility substitution can be effective and acceptable both nationally and internationally.

To sum up, it seems to the writers that the principal relationship at present between international lending and exchange is in the form of either a gift for the benefit of the borrowing library or an offer to exchange for the benefit of the supplying library. Neither can be systematised for the improvement of interlending. Only in countries where every resource must be employed to save currency in the acquisition of foreign material or where the development of a strong international exchange programme is given priority would co-ordination seem beneficial, and this might be at a sacrifice of the real need of the foreign lender or borrower, unless the alternative is offered without extra delay or cost in the fist instance.

The exception might be where the resources of a duplicate exchange centre may match interlending demand among countries of common culture, and that seems likely to be less useful than well organized international loan arrangements. Exchange in a supportive role to interlending is a matter for negotiation between individual libraries. If by arrangement the national loan centre can be persuaded, for itself or its country's libraries (perhaps in conjunction with a national exchange centre), to accept publications in lieu of interlending or photocopy reimbursement, this could enlarge the borrowing capacity of the supplying exchange partner. Such arrangements are suitable for incorporation in cultural exchange agreements between governments.

Some current blanket exchanges of periodicals or dissertations might be unnecessary if interlending could be improved or selective on-demand exchanges developed.

The usefulness of duplicate exchange to help build up dedicated loan collections is beyond question and the extent to which it will mitigate the need for borrowing depends on coincidence of the supply and the loan demand, although long term trends may smooth out disparities.

It seems unlikely because of the ephemeral nature of exchange stocks and the probable low coincidence with loan demand, that such stocks will be speedily incorporated into national bibliographical data bases and so become available to meet international loan demand.

References:

1. Schiltman, Maria J. ed. The international exchange of publications. Proceedings. Vienna, April 1972. Pullach/München, Verlag Dokumentation, 1973.

2. International lending: principles and guidelines for procedure (1978), in A Brief Guide to Centres of International Lending and Photocopying. 2nd ed. Boston Spa, IFLA Office for International Lending, 1979.

3. Resolutions and statements, in IFLA Annual 1973. Pullach/München, Verlag Dokumentation, 1974.

4. A Brief Guide to Centres of International Lending and Photocopying. 2nd ed. Boston Spa, IFLA Office for International Lending, 1979.

5. Sterescu, Alice. The interrelationship between the international exchange of publications and interlibrary loan. Paper presented to IFLA's Section on Exchange of Publications, 1973.

6. Rovelstad, Howard. The economics of the Universal Serials and Book Exchange (USBE). IFLA Conference Paper 47/EX/3E. 1978.

7. Popov, Vladimir and Dŭgmadziev, Juri, Die Rolle der photomechanischen Vervielfältigung und der Mikroformen im Tausch- Möglichkeiten und Perspektiven. IFLA Conference Paper 53/9/EX/2. 1977.

8. Bower, C. A. Patterns of use of the serial literature at the BLLD. BLL Review, 1976, 4 (2), 31-36.

9. Urquhart, D. J. Exchanges and interlibrary lending, in Schiltman, Maria J. ed. The international exchange of publications. Proceedings. Vienna, April 1972. Pullach/München, Verlag Dokumentation, 1973.